

7/26/67

Dear George,

Your No. 3 newsletter, mailed only two days ago, came by air. I'll see if the converse is true. Let me know.

It is a good job. For your information, not for publication, for there are already too many splits, I will make a few comments. However, there is also something you should do: I did not expect you'd use my piece so fast. I'm satisfied and not critical. ~~Now~~ I wrote it for BOOKS, the monthly and very lively paper by Jerry Agel, 598 Madison Ave. He, like you, is a friend, and I did it free. I spoke to your dad, telling him Jerry was going to use the documents and pictures I supplied. He asked that I get a proof to him and said he's prepare it for you to use. I'm sorry it didn't work out that way because I think you'd have found it more effective. Perhaps, if you are still interested, you can let your father know and he can prepare the documents, pictures, etc., for your use. I would like a credit to BOOKS, which has been interested from the very beginning and, as you may recall, printed the conclusions of WHITEWASH verbatim.

I think it unfair, despite the on-and-off friendship between Sylvia Meagher and Epstein, to lump them together. There can be no comparison. Epstein never has been a real "critic". He is the one "scavenger" who pretends to be a genuine critic and isn't. I've had student tell me he is accompanied by federal agents (I think at Iowa) who immediately get interested in those of the audience with critical question to Epstein (these were student from Madison). Regardless of what one thinks of Epstein, and my opinion is that he is a man of bottomless cowardice and no intellectual integrity, and regardless of how much one deplores Sylvia's public comment on Garrison, she is, without any doubt, more than just an authentic critic of the Warren Report. She has one of the best, if not the very best, grasp of the published material. She is uncompromising and honest in her use of this material.

She is also the victim of a great tragedy several of us have suffered. Her excellent book, which was still excellent in its earlier forms, before she had the benefit of the work of others, could not be published in its time. Therefore, when it finally did come out, it was largely lost and was, as were others, largely redundant. She and it deserve and deserved much better. Of the books covering the entire field of the Commission's published evidence, I consider hers one of the two best. Historically it may be judged the best. I feel that she has, as is understandable, been partly embittered by this history. Further, because of her employment, she is precluded from doing her own work in the Commission's suppressed files in the Archives and her own field investigations. These rob her of essential knowledge, prerequisite to the appraisal of Garrison she offers. She does not distinguish between her personal opinion of him and the evidence he can be expected to produce, or at the very least, what I know to be available to him for his use. In her passion, she has not restricted herself to the evidence or any pretense of the estimate of evidence. Her attack, which includes all critics not in accord with her attacks, is personal and has no relationship to the existence or non-existence of evidence. It is also important to understand that Garrison has never made any public reference to the evidence he expects to produce against Shaw in court. I have never asked him what he has and he has never volunteered it to me. I am satisfied, entirely from my own work, that there is a prima facie case that requires a judicial determination of fact. Such things as Sylvia and Epstein do make such a determination less likely and tend to corrupt the minds that will judge it in advance. Perhaps inaccurately, it has also been reported that she gave Kerry Thornley \$100.00 for his defense. I doubt if she has any knowledge of Thornley or the truth or falseness of what he and Lifton allege or of his indicto

ment. I know of no other critics who have done any work on Thronley, including Lifton, who still must live with his gross deception of Garrison about Thronley and what amounts to his framing of John Rene Heindell. From my own work, from the unassailable evidence I have gathered, including his own writings, only a small part of which I refer to in a recent letter to "Open City", I believe Sylvia will come to regret this impulsive and ill-considered act. There is no doubt in my mind that this much money spent on documents in the Archives would do more to help establish truth.

On Popkin, his representation of Garrison's interest is consistent with his own writings but not Garrison's beliefs. Popkin assumes Oswald involved and others, also involved were "second" Oswalds. Rather, despite the indictment, he considers these were what I called "False" Oswalds, and I have no reason to believe, as Popkin told you (again, his title, the "second" Oswald) that Garrison believes there was but one. I have reason to believe otherwise. Since I wrote WHITEWASH, I have seen nothing to cause me to change the formulation on 138 of the original edition, save this: I am now satisfied that so far as the assassination is concerned, his involvement was unwitting. Need I remind you that what Popkin attributes to Garrison, like his reference to a 1961 Oswald, I published? There are other 1961 indications I have but could not publish.

His plural comment, "unfortunately, the financial rewards involved in being a critic have led some people astray" cannot be plural unless his own reward was sufficient or he considers Epstein a serious, responsible critic, for none of the others have gotten any reward. In those few cases where the critics got cash, it could not, conceivably, be commensurate with the time and other costs to yield any meaningful return. He can (and I think properly) be referring to Lane alone, and I agree that Mark is both unscrupulous and unabashedly dishonest. He steals without apology, uses everyone else's work as his own, and then goes around and privately defames them. There are few with the knowledge to know how wretchedly dishonest his second book is. It is based upon lies and thefts when it need not have been, such is his ego, and he has taken an essential part of the total picture and recorded it in a way that destroys any basis for trust in it. If you are interested, I will discuss this with you in detail when I am there.

I didn't have this time. I'm adding to the ms. of COUP D'ETAT and want to finish it as fast as I can. I did want to tell you about BOOKS and, if you are interested, the available documentation never before published. Best to Malvina.

Sincerely,